

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed October 10, 2008, claims 1-13 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-13 are amended. Claim 14 has been added. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action suggests that section headings be added to the specification, according to the guidelines set forth in the MPEP. Applicants note that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicants respectfully decline to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biessener et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0088513, hereinafter Biessener). Additionally, claims 6-7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biessener in view of Jameson (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0054864). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Biessener and Jameson for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

“A memory device comprising:
a memory including a plurality of low-latency, rewritable, non-volatile memory cells;
a profile storage unit including access information;
an access control unit connected with said profile storage unit and said memory, said access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request, said access control unit further configured to determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request” (emphasis added).

In contrast, Biessener does not disclose an access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request. Biessener merely discloses a partition entry including a number of data fields (Biessener, par. [0058]). Biessener does not disclose that the partition entry is ascertained to an access request. Rather, Biessener is simply concerned with providing hardware-level security on a partition-by-partition basis (Biessener, par. [0060]). Furthermore, Biessener does not disclose determining access rights in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request. Rather, Biessener discloses that controller 6 rejects all storage access commands directed to the secure partition (Biessener, par. [0060]). The access control of Biessener is different from access rights in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request, because Biessener controls access to the partition based on the state of the partition, not in dependence on access information allocated to the request profile of the access request.

For the reasons presented above, Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Biessener does not disclose a control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request, said access control unit further configured to determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims 2-13

Claims 2-13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-13 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 2-13 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

In regard to claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 3 recites “a plurality of interfaces for communication with external memory clients and/or for communication according to different memory uses, said interfaces being

connected with said access control unit and each of said interfaces being allocated to a set of request profiles” (emphasis added). In contrast, Biessener merely discloses that controller 6 may maintain a plurality of partition tables, each for different users. The plurality of partition tables of Biessener are different from interfaces being allocated to a set of request profiles because Biessener maintains the plurality of partition tables in the controller, and the different users would access the different partition tables through the same interface. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 3 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose “interfaces being connected with said access control unit and each of said interfaces being allocated to a set of request profiles” as recited in claim 3.

In regard to claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is also not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 8 recites “a supervisor interface adapted to create or change at least one request profile and/or access information allocated thereto, given a predetermined condition” (emphasis added). In contrast, the cited portion of Biessener (par. [0015]) merely discloses preventing or providing limited access to certain partitions. However, Biessener does not disclose that request profile and/or access information can be created or changed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose “a supervisor interface adapted to create or change at least one request profile and/or access information allocated thereto, given a predetermined condition” as recited in claim 8.

In regard to claims 9, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is also not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 9 recites that “said supervisor interface is adapted to admit or reject external requests for change of a request profile, depending on access information allocated to at least one predetermined change request” (emphasis added). In contrast, the cited portion of Biessener (par. [0018]) does not disclose admission or rejection of external requests. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose that “said supervisor interface is adapted to admit or reject external requests for change of a request profile,

depending on access information allocated to at least one predetermined change request” as recited in claim 9.

New Claims

New claim 14 includes similar language to claim 1. Although the language of claims 14 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 14 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert claim 14 is patentable over and not anticipated by the cited references because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the limitations of the claim, as explained above.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 29, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111